Page 1 1 UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT 2 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK 3 Case No. 08-01789-brl 5 In the Matter of: 6 7 SECURITIES INVESTOR PROTECTION CORPORATION, 8 Plaintiff, 9 10 v. 11 12 BERNARD L. MADOFF, INVESTMENT SECURITES, LLC., Defendant. 13 14 15 United States Bankruptcy Court 16 One Bowling Green 17 New York, New York 18 December 17, 2013 19 20 10:03 a.m. 21 22 BEFORE: 23 HON BURTON R. LIFLAND 24 U.S. BANKRUPTCY JUDGE 25

Page 2 1 (cc-5584) Windels Marx Lane & Mittendorf, LLP Twelfth 2 Application for Allowance of Interim Compensation for Services Rendered and Reimbursement of Actual and Necessary 3 4 Expenses Incurred from May 1, 2013 through July 31, 2013 and Request for Partial Release of Holdback for Windels Marx 5 6 Lane & Mittendorf, LLP, Special Counsel, period: 5/1/2013 to 7 7/31/2014, fee: \$1,590,346.00, expenses: \$7,737.22 8 9 (cc-5567) Schiltz & Schiltz as Special Counsel to the 10 Trustee Application for Allowance of Interim Compensation 11 for Services Rendered and Reimbursement of Actual and 12 Necessary Expenses Incurred from May 1, 2013 through July 13 31, 2013 for Schiltz & Schiltz, Special Counsel, period: 5/1/2013 to 7/31/2013, fee: \$65,470.66, expenses: \$4,255.59 14 15 16 (cc-5568) Higgs & Johnson (formerly Higgs Johnson Truman 17 Bodden & Co.) as Special Counsel to the Trustee's Application for Allowance of Interim Compensation for 18 19 Services Rendered and Reimbursement of Actual and Necessary 20 Expenses Incurred from May 1, 2013 through July 31, 2013 for 21 Higgs, Johnson, Truman, Bodden & Co., Special Counsel, 22 period: 5/1/2013 to 7/31/2013, fee: \$70,193.25, expenses: 23 \$1,186.90 24 25

Page 3 1 (cc-5569) Soroker - Agmon as Special Counsel to the Trustee 2 Application for Allowance of Interim Compensation for Services Rendered and Reimbursement of Actual and Necessary 3 Expenses Incurred from May 1, 2013 through July 31, 2013 for 4 5 Soroker-Agmon, Special Counsel, period: 5/1/2013 to 6 7/31/2013, fee: \$187,952.44, expenses: \$74.34 7 (cc-5570) Graf & Pitkowitz Rechtsanwalte GmbH as Special 8 9 Counsel to the Trustee's Application for Allowance of 10 Interim Compensation for Services Rendered and Reimbursement 11 of Actual and Necessary Expenses Incurred from May 1, 2013 12 through July 31, 2013 for Graf & Pitkowitz Rechtsanwalte 13 GmbH, Special Counsel, period: 5/1/2013 to 7/31/2013, fee: 14 \$548,430.68, expenses: \$5,068.65 15 16 (cc-5571) SCA Creque as Special Counsel to the Trustee 17 Application for Allowance of Interim Compensation for Services Rendered and Reimbursement of Actual and Necessary 18 Expenses Incurred from May 1, 2013 through July 31, 2013 for 19 20 SCA Creque, Special Counsel, period: 5/1/2013 to 7/31/2013, 21 fee: \$28,090.07, expenses: \$20.00 22 23 24 25

Page 4 1 (cc-5572) Young, Conaway, Stargatt & Taylor, LLP as Special 2 Counsel to the Trustee Application for Allowance of Interim Compensation for Services Rendered and Reimbursement of 3 4 Actual and Necessary Expenses Incurred from May 1, 2013 5 through July 31, 2013 for Young, Conaway, Stargatt & Taylor, 6 LLP, Special Counsel, period: 5/1/2013 to 7/31/2013, fee: 7 \$20,503.80, expenses: \$1,555.39 8 9 (cc-5573) Williams, Barristers & Attorneys as Special 10 Counsel to the Trustee Application for Allowance of Interim 11 Compensation for Services Rendered and Reimbursement of 12 Actual and Necessary Expenses Incurred from May 1, 2013 13 through July 31, 2013 for Williams, Barristers & Attorneys, 14 Special Counsel, period: 5/1/2013 to 7/31/2013, fee: 15 \$101,219.42, expenses: \$0 16 17 (cc-5566) Trustee and Baker & Hostetler, LLP's Thirteenth Application for Allowance of Interim Compensation for 18 19 Services Rendered and Reimbursement of Actual and Necessary 20 Expenses Incurred from May 1, 2013 through July 31, 2013 for 21 Baker & Hostetler, LLP, Trustee's Attorney, period: 5/1/2013 22 to 7/31/2013, fee: \$31,487,024.25, expenses: \$810,213.07 23 24 25

Page 5 1 (cc-5574) Taylor Wessing as Special Counsel to the Trustee 2 Application for Allowance of Interim Compensation for Services Rendered and Reimbursement of Actual and Necessary 3 Expenses Incurred from May 1, 2013 through July 31, 2013 for 4 5 Taylor Wessing, Special Counsel, period: 5/1/2013 to 6 7/31/2013, fees: \$3,609,012.69, expenses: \$2,056,092.17 7 (cc-55834) Kelley, Wolter & Scott, P.A. as Special Counsel 8 9 to the Trustee Application for Allowance of Interim 10 Compensation for Services Rendered and Reimbursement of 11 Actual and Necessary Expenses Incurred from July 1, 2013 12 through July 31, 2013 for Kelley, Wolter & Scott, P.A., 13 Special Counsel, period: 7/1/2013 to 7/31/2013, fees: \$3,733.20, expenses: \$110.00 14 15 16 (cc-5575) UGGC & Associates as Special Counsel to the 17 Trustee Application for Allowance of Interim Compensation for Services Rendered and Reimbursement of Actual and 18 Necessary Expenses Incurred from May 1, 2013 through July 19 20 31, 2013 for UGGC & Associates, Special Counsel, period: 21 5/1/2013 to 7/31/2013, fees: \$170,393.77, expenses: 22 \$4,896.64 23 24 25

Page 6 1 (cc-5576) Triay Stagnetto Neish as Special Counsel to the 2 Trustee Application for Allowance of Interim Compensation for Services Rendered and Reimbursement of Actual and 3 4 Necessary Expenses Incurred from May 1, 2013 through July 5 31, 2013 for Triay Stagnetto Neish, Special Counsel, period: 6 5/1/2013 to 7/31/2013, fees: \$31,993.53, expenses: \$221.87 7 (cc-5577) Werder Vigano as Special Counsel to the Trustee 8 9 Application for Allowance of Interim Compensation for 10 Services Rendered and Reimbursement of Actual and Necessary 11 Expenses Incurred from May 1, 2013 through July 31, 2013 for 12 Werder Vigano, Special Counsel, period: 5/1/2013 to 13 7/31/2013, fees: \$5,701.15, expenses: \$0 14 15 (cc-5578) Greenfield Stein & Senior, LLP as Special Counsel 16 to the Trustee Application for Allowance of Interim 17 Compensation for Services Rendered and Reimbursement of 18 Actual and Necessary Expenses Incurred from May 1, 2013 through July 31, 2013 for Greenfield Stein & Senior, LLP, 19 20 Special Counsel, period: 5/1/2013 to 7/31/2013, fees: 21 \$863.10, expenses: \$0 22 23 24 25

Page 7 (cc-5579) Browne Jacobson, LLP as Special Counsel to the 1 2 Trustee Application for Allowance of Interim Compensation for Services Rendered and Reimbursement of Actual and 3 4 Necessary Expenses Incurred from May 1, 2013 through July 5 31, 2013 for Browne Jacobson, Special Counsel, period: 6 5/1/2013 to 7/31/2013, fees: \$408,874.01, expenses: 7 \$14,836.89 8 9 (cc-5580) Eugene F. Collins as Special Counsel to the 10 Trustee Application for Allowance of Interim Compensation 11 for Services Rendered and Reimbursement of Actual and 12 Necessary Expenses Incurred from May 1, 2013 through July 13 31, 2013 for Eugene F. Collins, Special Counsel, period: 5/1/2013 to 7/31/2013, fees: \$87,053.58, expenses: \$240.10 14 15 16 (cc-5581) Ritter & Ritter Advokatur as Special Counsel to 17 the Trustee Application for Allowance of Interim Compensation for Services Rendered and Reimbursement of 18 Actual and Necessary Expenses Incurred from May 1, 2013 19 20 through July 31, 2013 for Ritter & Ritter Advokatur, Special Counsel, period: 5/1/2013 to 7/31/2013, fees: \$38,150.06, 21 22 expenses: \$1,851.92 23 24 25

Page 8 (cc-5582) Munari Giudici Maniglio Panfili E Associati as Special Counsel to the Trustee Application for Allowance of Interim Compensation for Services Rendered and Reimbursement of Actual and Necessary Expenses Incurred from May 1, 2013 through July 31, 2013 for Munari Giudici Maniglio Panfili E Associati, Special Counsel, period: 5/1/2013 to 7/31/2013, fees: \$56,337.36, expenses: \$201.21 Transcribed by: Sherri L. Breach, CERT*D-397

Page 9 1 APPEARANCES: 2 SECURITIES INVESTMENT PROTECTION CORPORATION (SiPC) 3 Attorneys for Plaintiff 4 805 15th Street, N.W. 5 Suite 800 6 Washington, D.C. 20005 7 8 BY: KEVIN H. BELL, ESQ. 9 10 BAKER HOSTETLER 11 Attorneys for Irving Picard, Trustee 12 45 Rockefeller Plaza 13 New York, New York 10111 14 15 BY: IRVING H. PICARD, ESQ. 16 DAVID J. SHEEHAN, ESQ. 17 18 ALSO APPEARING: 19 HOWARD SIMON 20 21 22 23 24 25

	Page 10
1	PROCEEDINGS
2	THE COURT: Good morning, all.
3	(A chorus of good morning)
4	THE COURT: Look what the snow can do.
5	Unbelievable.
6	THE CLERK: SiPC v BMIS.
7	THE COURT: Where's my where's my off button
8	here? We got a new system.
9	(Pause)
10	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Turn it down.
11	MR. SHEEHAN: It's quite all right, Your Honor.
12	Thank you for accommodating us today.
13	THE COURT: It's not a problem.
14	MR. PICARD: There are a few people, I think,
15	stuck in the line downstairs.
16	THE COURT: Shall we give them time, then?
17	MR. SHEEHAN: Well, the only person who I'm sure
18	would like to be heard is Mr. Bell who is here from SiPC and
19	I understand he's in the line. So
20	THE COURT: All right. We'll take
21	MR. SHEEHAN: I don't know how long it will be.
22	THE COURT: We'll take second call.
23	MR. SHEEHAN: Okay.
24	THE COURT: Fifteen 15 minutes.
25	MR. SHEEHAN: Okay. Fine, Judge. All right.

Page 11 1 Thanks. 2 THE COURT: Is it possible to make an announcement 3 downstairs that anybody waiting for this hearing could be 4 brought forward? Contact the guards. 5 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I'll --6 THE COURT: Yeah. 7 (Recess taken at 10:05 a.m.; resume at 10:13) THE CLERK: SiPC v BMIS. 8 MR. SHEEHAN: Good morning, Your Honor. David --9 10 THE COURT: Good morning, Mr. Sheehan. MR. SHEEHAN: -- Sheehan on behalf of the trustee 11 12 from Baker & Hostetler. 13 THE COURT: Can we have appearances? MR. PICARD: Irving Picard, the trustee. 14 15 MR. BELL: Kevin Bell from the Securities Investor 16 Protection Corporation. 17 MR. SIMON: Howard Simon from Windels Marx. 18 MR. SHEEHAN: Thank you, Your Honor. Your Honor, first of all, thank you very much for 19 20 this accommodation seeing us here to -- on special notice 21 here this morning. I know that in the past what I've done 22 is, is gone through a recitation of the work done by a 23 number of the law firms internationally that have worked for 24 us and, aside from one significant event which took place 25 during the reporting period, I thought today I would forego

that and actually talk more about what the trustee's counsel has been doing and what's been happening in the major cases that it is handling together with Windels Marx who has been working with us hand in hand in most of those cases, if that's all right with Your Honor?

THE COURT: Sure.

MR. SHEEHAN: So starting first, of course, in the international arena there was, as Your Honor is well aware, an event that took us, quite honestly, somewhat by surprise, and that is, is that we tried Sonja Kohn matter in the United Kingdom, tried it for six weeks without a jury before Judge Popplewell. He then rendered a decision sometime in early October in which he found for the defendants and did find against in that case not the trustee, but Stephen Akers who is the liquidator for MSIL in London and found that Sonja Kohn was, indeed, a legitimate business woman who was entitled to receive these payments, notwithstanding the allegations and proofs of the -- of the liquidator, Mr. Akers, to the effect that the company was insolvent, which we thoroughly proved, we thought, through the auspices of FTI.

Mr. Popplewell or Judge Popplewell did his own analysis. There was no contest of the solvency, no expert presented in -- against it. In fact, it was not challenged. But he, on his own, found the company to be solvent by

reviewing the records and found \$38 million that was, in fact, not proven to be stolen money among the hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars that we did prove to be stolen, billions to be exact, and said, therefore, it was solvent from his perspective.

Once he made that finding the rest that flowed from that made it very difficult for us, as Your Honor can surmise, in the sense that the ratification of what was an order from the owner of the company, Mr. Madoff, who he found to be someone who at that time they could rely upon as having sound business judgment and, therefore, he could, therefore, go ahead and pay these payments to Sonja Kohn if he wished to because it was his company.

And I can tell you this, that the legal industry in the United Kingdom is royaling with this judgment as to what the responsibilities are for directors at this point because this seems to give them a free reign to do anything they damn well pleased want.

So we've looked at that very, very carefully. We actually had what I refer to euphemistically as a cold silk (sic) look at it, meaning that we've had a member of the Queen's bench who is a silk look at it, Robin Ditcher (ph) who is a very, very talented foremost bankruptcy lawyer in the United Kingdom, a barrister, and he looked at it and gave us the opinion that while it was challengeable, it

would be very, very difficult for us to succeed on appeal given the findings of the Court, given the fact that the Court was both the fact-finder as well as the arbiter of the law.

That being the case and it being a very, very narrow ruling, we were seeking there only the monies paid to Sonja Kohn in return for what were supposed to be reports, financial analysis and reports that she would develop for them and then assist MISL as well as BLMIX (sic).

We had an expert testify that they were valueless and that they were plagiarized and he said, well, that was up to Mr. Madoff to decide. If -- he didn't disagree they were plagiarized. He simply thought, the Court, that if Mr. Madoff wanted to pay for plagiarized material that was his business.

So it was a very, very interesting outcome for us. It was kind of a bizarre ruling to say the least. But that being the case, I must admit to you that while it was difficult for us to arrive at the conclusion not to take the appeal, we did decide to do that. We have preliminarily, through Mr. Aker's has paid some of the counsel fees there. I don't think it will have any impact on the estate here. It will impact the monies that would have otherwise been distributed to Mr. Picard by MSIL because they'll be diminished as a result of these fees being paid.

But, overall, the impact on us; that is, the cases that we have here before Your Honor, the cases that we're prosecuting throughout Europe -- for example, we've already been in contact with the Liechtenstein, Luxembourg and Austrian officials, all of whom consider the decision, to put it mildly, an outlier. They're not relying upon it at all. They don't see it as persuasive and they don't understand how the Court reached the result it did.

So having said all that, though, that that kind of a bizarre detour as it were, and I use that term advisably, in the middle of this five-year litigation has been something of an interesting time for us. But at the end of the day, we've made, I think, the considered and correct judgment that what we should do here is just move on. We will continue with our litigation.

We have already been and we have lawyers right now in Vienna working with the Austrian authorities because the target there ultimately, as Your Honor well knows from the pleadings that we file, is not Sonja Kohn, but her as the go between for Bank of Austria, Bank Medici, in which she was the 75 percent owner and Bank of Austria was the 25 percent owner, and then after that, of course, UniCredit who ultimately, a bank in Italy, that ultimately owns Bank of America and whose tenure most of the fraudulent transfers took place.

so while it has something of an impact on the estate generally, it's de minimis, but only in -- in that legally we do not believe after analysis that we will have any problems with it. Although I do believe, as I think Your Honor well understands, that you will hear about it. I don't doubt that some of our colleagues -- I've heard already from some of the attorneys here -- that how could we possibly move forward now in light of these issues with regard to certain defendants.

Again, that's ultimately for Your Honor to decide.

It's the trustee's position that this should have no impact whatsoever and ultimately, if those issues are raised, we'll litigate them before Your Honor and Your Honor will decide what impact there really is going to be had here.

So that was the major event in Europe. The rest of the events that took place over there were more or less routine, if anything is routine in the Madoff matter, meaning that there was continuing ongoing investigations throughout those jurisdictions. The trustee, other than the setback in the United Kingdom, has been successful in every other arena in terms of moving forward and working cooperatively with the authorities.

There is no trial scheduled in Europe at this point that will take place before any further trials will take place here, which we fully anticipate will happen this

year, which is this year being -- I'm sorry -- 2014, which is probably a good segway into what the trustee is actually and Baker & Hostetler have been doing during the reporting period. And I may step outside out that a little bit just to complete a thought.

But what we've been doing since Judge Rakoff issued his rulings earlier on in the case in Katz Wilpon and some of its progeny and he decided that the standard of -- or proof of good faith would involve actual intent; that we have to prove not a actual -- that they had actual intent -- actual intent meaning that they had knowledge of the fraud where some have argued knowledge of a Ponzi scheme.

So he gave us guidelines, as Your Honor will recall, because in that decision that he rendered he gave us guidelines in the sense that he reviewed our Cohmad complaint and he found a Cohmad complaint, thereby implicitly without overtly stating, that it's a pleading standard. He found that the Cohmad complaint withstood the analysis of what was required in order to allege actual intent.

And if you read the Cohmad complaint it talks about Cohmad complaint -- it talks about intent in terms of knowledge of a fraud. We never mentioned Ponzi scheme in that complaint. So if that withstood the challenge, we believe that the standard is actual knowledge of the fraud.

THE COURT: Interestingly, in today's media there's an essay by Judge Rakoff where he seems to extol the concept of willful blindness.

MR. SHEEHAN: I understand that. Well, and we found other decisions by Judge Rakoff that equates willful blindness with actual intent. So I think it's going to be an interesting journey as we move forward because I -- as Your Honor knows, and I don't want to step on that here, but there is already a motion before Your Honor seeking to dismiss one of our complaints based on that standard. It's -- it will be -- it's not already fully briefed, it -- I think it is actually.

But, in any event, what we've been doing is this.

And a lot of the effort of the trustee and his counsel were,
in all of the cases that we have that allege bad faith, have
been amending the complaints. Throughout the three or four
years leading up to that decision, we were doing a lot of
discovery. We were discovering third parties. We were
actually engaging in some 2004s with regard to even the
parties themselves with regard to issues that we could
proceed with.

As Your Honor will recall, Your Honor found that very SiPC case in which 2004s can go forward even though litigation has been instituted if you're going with regard to a third party who has not been joined to the litigation

as yet.

So we've been doing all of those things and amending all of the complaints internally in full anticipation that we will either have to do it by way of a motion made to dismiss and, therefore, have to upgrade, if you will, our complaints, or we will do them voluntarily. You will start to see, as we did in Merca (sic), we had filed the complaint and then the motion to dismiss was filed.

We anticipate that there will be a good deal of motion practice that will take place with regard to that and we're fully prepared for it because we've been working very, very hard to amend our complaints and get them ready.

In addition, we've re-crafted a lot of our discovery. As Your Honor might suspect, because of the motion to withdraw the reference practice that took place starting in 2011 and all through 2012 into 2013, we were slowed down quite a bit with regard to obtaining discovery in any number of matters. But that didn't stop us from pursuing discovery in many, many cases and we have been doing that.

A good deal of it has been third party discovery because, as Your Honor well knows, once it reached the recipient or the defendant in any of these cases -- and this is another area we've worked very hard on -- there are going

to be a lot of subsequent transferees and there are a number of subsequent transferee actions that we've already brought, and there may even still be some that we are yet to bring because we have not a -- made the initial avoidances yet.

But the difficulty there is is that in this instance many of the people that are on the subsequent side are nominees. We're not looking at the actual recipitier (sic) or the ultimate person who is going to get the money. So we are penetrating through those nominees. That's true with Kingate, for example. That's true in a number of other areas. It was true, for example, in Embest (ph) which we settled with.

So the hurdles here aren't your normal hurdles of just chasing the money and getting banks to give you all of the transfers. We do do that and we are not only going through a number of Rule 45 subpoenas to banks to get all of those records, we are also sending preservation letters out because as time has progressed we've lost time due to the motions to withdraw the reference. We're concerned about bank records. And although there should be holds on all of these records, we're not relying up on that. We're reaching out to all the banks, making sure that the banks preserve records with regard to all of these transactions because in order to prove them, having those bank records will be of great assistance to us.

So you can see we're operating on many fronts here with regard to all of these cases. And when people look at our efforts and they question, well, why are you spending this much time and money, it's the multiples that are involved here. Every one of these cases involves hundreds of millions if not billions of dollars. They are adequately defended, to put it mildly, by all of their, you know, esteemed counsel and they are not going to just simply turn over everything to us. It's been quite the battle on each of these fronts.

And we've been trying to resolve as many of them because I know that's Your Honor preferences, as it is with most courts, not to have to handle these discovery disputes. And we've been pretty successful, by and large, in most of them, including recently Your Honor's entry of the order with regard to the data room, third party data room, which is going to, I think, be a very innovative tool. We'll save a lot of time and money, and we spent a lot of time during the reporting period putting that together and negotiating with all the parties that were involved, a myriad objections. As Your Honor can imagine, just the creative imagination of lawyers to find an objection to a discovery procedure knows no bounds.

So they -- we dealt with all of those. And then we obviously filed the order. The order has now been

entered. We're in the process of setting that up because next year, as I said earlier, is going to be an incredible year in terms of discovery, motion practice and in some instances, as Your Honor knows, we've already schedule a trial in the good faith cases with Your Honor, the MUUS case. We fully anticipate that that hopefully will become the standard by which we can then craft mediations and resolve the balance of those cases.

We have been engaging with a collective group, if you will, of good faith defense counsel to try to craft and we'll try to bring to Your Honor a coordinated calendar so that we can operate in a way that everyone is aware of what's transpiring.

That with regard to even the motion practice that is currently before Your Honor through Ms. Chapeman (ph) that what we try to do there -- and I've reached out to defense counsel. I would like not to have Your Honor or ourselves have to deal with this on a repeated basis. There should be a way to bring everyone to this forum now so that once this is decided we can move forward with these cases and have all these issues behind us, save for whatever appeal may take place.

All that is happening, but that is, as I said earlier I'm stepping outside the reporting period, that's more so happening today. But, nonetheless, is a direct

derivative of what we were doing during the reporting period time and that is knowing that eventually the motions to withdraw the reference in Judge Rakoff's decision would be handed down based upon his Stern Marshall decision that they would be coming to you, and that, therefore, we should be prepared for trial. And that's what we've been doing and spending an enormous amount of time doing that and working, you know, as I say, very cooperatively with most of the defense counsel to get all of these things ready.

Throughout that process, Windels Marx has been our right hand. There is no question that they have done a superb job here with regard to all the cases that they have. We are in daily communication with them. We share a great deal of information, still abiding, of course, by whatever conflict walls that we need to have engaged because of their work for us in matters for which we have a conflict. But there are matters that they work on.

For example, we have all these leverage cases that I know Your Honor's familiar with, but just quickly they are the cases where banks, such as Nomura and brokerage houses such as Merrill Lynch and Citi and others, and JPMorgan for that matter, created structured products that they should to their high net worth individuals and then took those products and invested them in places like Fairfield on a three for one basis, either as notes or derivatives or

swaps.

And these are very complicated transactions involving, again, hundreds of millions of dollars. We've sued all of those banks for those transactions to get those redemptions back because, as Your Honor will recall, very startlingly in the JPMorgan matter they redeemed in October, all right, at the same time they filed their SARS report that they were aware of illegal activity in the UK. So needless to say we think we have a strong case with regard to that redemption.

But the point is is that that kind of activity was not unique. It's ripe throughout all of these structured products, but they're difficult cases, difficult because of the sophistication of the investment products that were involved and because of the fact that they went through several layers to go through all of that.

So, in particular, Mr. Simon, who is here in court today, is heading up several of those leverage cases, even though there's no conflict that we have with regard to it because we need the skill and support of that firm to make that happen. And it's been invaluable to us and to the estate and obviously to the trustee. So that the combined effort of both of these firms has been, you know, towards bringing these cases to the floor.

Along the way, as Your Honor knows, we have,

remarkably enough, notwithstanding, you know, the if you will haze that may have been created by the motions to withdraw the reference and the lack of clarity, we have still managed a number of settlements. Some of them smaller like Beacon Andover or larger like Maxum. But each of these represents -- you know, I say smaller and yet, you know, it was over \$20 million in Beacon Andover. There used to be a day when you would say you had a \$20 million settlement and it was a very nice settlement. You were very proud to bring that, and we are proud to bring that to the Court.

But at the same time when you look at that compared to the others that we've managed to achieve, it does look smaller, but at the same time very significant that it happens because what is also going on during the reporting period is this, is that because of the relentless work of the trustee and his counsel and those whose support it like Windels Marx, I think we've been able to maintain the credibility of the trustee and the viability of all of his causes of action, notwithstanding the attacks that have been taken upon him in the Federal District Court in a lot of the motions to withdraw the reference.

I think the recent decisions by Judge Rakoff also vindicate the narrative created by the trustee. The trustee has taken the narrative throughout that what has gone on here is totally consistent with the Bankruptcy Code and the

law before it. I think the recently antecedent debt decision and the five -- and the subsequent transferee decision or 550 decision by Judge Rakoff proves that because if you read both of those decisions they are very traditional decisions of bankruptcy law, which is what we always said ultimately would win out here.

And so that narrative has -- that has sustained us throughout this process is recognized by our adversaries and continues to be a very strong part of what we do every day in terms of trying to advance the cases. It's in our interest to close these cases as quickly as possible.

I should report to Your Honor, for example, that on time based damages, notwithstanding your efforts and ours, the Second Circuit has not as yet acted on our ask for -- our request for a direct appeal, even though I'm told we have very good papers there. Your Honor and counsel acted promptly. But we can't control those things.

But what we can do is do things as efficiently and as quickly as possible, keep the pressure on, and which I think we do across many, many fronts every day. This is what I call to my colleagues a five-year TRO. It never stops. Every day there's something going on and something happening, and we're expected to respond to it. Even now, even though it's outside the reporting period, there's a very public ongoing criminal trial. We work and assist the

U.S. Attorney in that matter every day.

So we're there assisting and providing support logistically, witnesses such as Bruce Dubinsky who we spent many, many hours and many, many dollars preparing because this is a very difficult analysis. It may look simple at the conclusion, but going through the process is very, very significant.

said, a lot of this, as Your Honor well knows, is laid out in our interim reports and obviously in the current fee application. But I thought in the past when I have dwelled on the international aspects of this case it might look as though I was overlooking what we do here in the United States. And it is a significant effort, as I say, every day.

So I wanted to submit that to Your Honor together with all of the international applications and those of Windels Marx.

And now I would like to turn the podium over to Mr. Bell for his comments with regard to the applications before Your Honor.

Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: With respect to -- Mr. Sheehan --

MR. SHEEHAN: Yes.

THE COURT: Excuse me a minute.

Page 28 1 MR. SHEEHAN: Yes, Your Honor. 2 THE COURT: -- to the time based damages certification to the circuit, I assume you've been joined 3 with the parties on the other side with respect to --4 5 MR. SHEEHAN: Yes. It's a collective effort. 6 THE COURT: Yeah. I wonder how or where in the 7 circuit is -- that there's \$1.4 billion --MR. SHEEHAN: It was prominently mentioned in our 8 9 papers that this is a significant -- that, for example, it's 10 a ten-cent swing weaving up from 43 to a 53 cent 11 distribution if we did not have the reserve. And we told 12 them that. 13 THE COURT: Does the circuit procedure include a meeting with the -- there used to be some meeting with a --14 15 MR. SHEEHAN: Well, Your Honor --16 THE COURT: -- a committee? 17 MR. SHEEHAN: -- (indiscernible) because just 18 yesterday I talked to defense counsel about setting up a call with our case manager to do just that, so that we can 19 20 bring it to their attention like -- as -- without being 21 disrespectful asked our case manager, can we have a 22 conference so that we can see where this is and that we can 23 keep it moving. 24 THE COURT: Very well. Thank you. 25 MR. SHEEHAN: Thank you, Your Honor.

Page 29 1 MR. BELL: Good morning, Your Honor. Kevin Bell 2 for SiPC. 3 THE COURT: Sorry for the interruption, Mr. Bell. 4 MR. BELL: We -- excuse me, Your Honor. 5 THE COURT: I said sorry for the interruption. 6 MR. BELL: Oh, no problem, Your Honor. 7 SiPC has filed its recommendations in support of the international foreign special counsel, Windels, Marx; 8 9 Young, Conaway; the Kelley firm, and the Greenfield firm. 10 And I think they speak for themselves. 11 One point on Windels is that SiPC wholeheartedly 12 supports the reduction of the holdback that's been kept back at our request in the Court's order by 50 percent at this 13 14 time because we do believe, as Windels said, it becomes 15 burdensome for a firm that size to have that large sum of 16 money withheld. And SiPC supports an entry of an order 17 reducing that holdback at this time. 18 And we echo Mr. Sheehan's comments about the excellence of the work by the Windels firm throughout and, 19 20 particularly, Mr. Simon. 21 As to the Baker Hostetler revised recommendation, we filed -- some lawyer at SiPC, namely myself, forgot to 22 talk about the reduction of the holdback in the first 23 24 recommendation, so we filed one that afternoon after I 25 realized my error. SiPC, as in paragraph 4 you will see

that even after the applications were filed by Baker on or about November 21st, we continued our review and we requested additional adjustments which you will see in the submission by Baker of the proposed order and the attachment.

The ultimate reduction by Baker is approximately

14.73 percent from the standard fees they would charge.

This reduction includes the voluntary ten percent reduction which all counsel for the trustee have agreed to throughout this case, including all the applicants here.

SiPC supports the application and also with regard to Baker the reduction of the holdback by 25 percent at this time which equals a little more than \$8.7 million in a reduction of the holdback.

SiPC, as you know, on every one of these applications -- and this is the thirteenth by Baker Hostetler -- spends a good deal of time at many levels by SiPC lawyers, myself included, in discussions with Mr. Sheehan with regard to adjustments, comments, and monitoring of what is going on, and we participate regularly in discussions going forward. And, in fact, I was talking to my general counsel late yesterday evening about the issue you just brought up about time based damages, and she says, isn't it time enough for the circuit to set something.

So, you know, it's something that's there on our

mind because it does -- it does keep a significant sum of money out of the customers' hands. And, you know, Your Honor, when we started this case not many people thought we would get more than two cents back to the customers and SiPC would really appreciate getting that time based damages decision that you issued affirmed by the circuit and, if need be, a petition for cert denied by the Supreme Court so that we can get that substantial sum of money into the hands of the victims.

And so I will conclude by asking Your Honor to enter the orders that have been submitted to you at this time. And any questions you would wish, Your Honor, I can try and answer.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Bell.

MR. BELL: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Anyone else want to be heard?

Well, as Mr. Bell pointed out, this is what, the thirteenth --

MR. BELL: Thirteenth.

THE COURT: -- application. The ruling is based upon the law which in the case on the trustee's fees and the fees that are also ancillary here, the Court has almost no discretion. There are a series of shalls (sic) in SIPA 78(eee)(b)(5)(a) and (c) which give the Court no discretion when certain factors align themselves, and that is that the

Page 32 1 allowances to be paid by SiPC, without reasonable 2 expectation of recoupment, there is -- and there's no 3 difference between the amounts requested and the amounts recommended by SiPC, the Court shall -- and shall in caps --4 5 award the amounts recommended by SiPC. 6 All of those factors have lined up here. 7 Court, even if it had to go back beyond 1978 when the Court did have discretion, probably under and I assume under every 8 factor that I've seen before me would not challenge the fees 9 10 that are requested here. I recognize the enormous amount of 11 effort and I also recognize the very substantial recoveries 12 that have been the sequela (sic) from that effort. 13 Accordingly, and in accordance with the recommendations of SiPC, the voluntary discounts and the 14 15 requests for partial release of the holdbacks, I do grant 16 those requests. 17 MR. SHEEHAN: Thank you. Thank you, Your Honor. 18 THE COURT: Submit an appropriate order. MR. SHEEHAN: Yes, we will, Your Honor. 19 20 (A chorus of thank you) 21 MR. SHEEHAN: And thank you again for 22 accommodating us today. 23 THE COURT: The snow let us all get here today. I 24 don't know if it will let us get out of here, but --25 (Laughter)

```
Page 33
 1
                MR. SHEEHAN: Yeah. Well, we all should leave
 2
     shortly.
 3
                THE COURT: Thank you, all.
 4
                MR. PICARD: Thank you, Your Honor.
 5
           (Whereupon these proceedings were concluded at 10:43
 6
     a.m.)
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

	Pg 54 01 44		Page 34
1	INDEX		
2			
3	RULINGS		
4	DESCRIPTION	PAGE	LINE
5	(cc-5584) Windels Marx Lane & Mittendorf,		
6	LLP Twelfth Application for Allowance of		
7	Interim Compensation for Services Rendered		
8	and Reimbursement of Actual and Necessary		
9	Expenses Incurred from May 1, 2013 through		
10	July 31, 2013 and Request for Partial		
11	Release of Holdback for Windels Marx Lane		
12	& Mittendorf, LLP, Special Counsel, period:		
13	5/1/2013 to 7/31/2014, fee: \$1,590,346.00,		
14	expenses: \$7,737.22	32	13
15			
16	(cc-5567) Schiltz & Schiltz as Special		
17	Counsel to the Trustee Application for		
18	Allowance of Interim Compensation for		
19	Services Rendered and Reimbursement of		
20	Actual and Necessary Expenses Incurred		
21	from May 1, 2013 through July 31, 2013		
22	for Schiltz & Schiltz, Special Counsel,		
23	period: 5/1/2013 to 7/31/2013, fee:		
24	\$65,470.66, expenses: \$4,255.59	32	13
25			

Pg 35 0t 44		
		Page 35
INDEX		
RULINGS		
DESCRIPTION	PAGE	LINE
(cc-5568) Higgs & Johnson (formerly Higgs		
Johnson Truman Bodden & Co.) as Special		
Counsel to the Trustee's Application for		
Allowance of Interim Compensation for		
Services Rendered and Reimbursement of		
Actual and Necessary Expenses Incurred		
from May 1, 2013 through July 31, 2013		
for Higgs, Johnson, Truman, Bodden & Co.,		
Special Counsel, period: 5/1/2013 to		
7/31/2013, fee: \$70,193.25, expenses:		
\$1,186.90	32	13
(cc-5569) Soroker - Agmon as Special Counsel		
to the Trustee Application for Allowance of		
Interim Compensation for Services Rendered		
and Reimbursement of Actual and Necessary		
Expenses Incurred from May 1, 2013 through		
July 31, 2013 for Soroker-Agmon, Special		
Counsel, period: 5/1/2013 to 7/31/2013,		
fee: \$187,952.44, expenses: \$74.34	32	13
	RULINGS DESCRIPTION (cc-5568) Higgs & Johnson (formerly Higgs Johnson Truman Bodden & Co.) as Special Counsel to the Trustee's Application for Allowance of Interim Compensation for Services Rendered and Reimbursement of Actual and Necessary Expenses Incurred from May 1, 2013 through July 31, 2013 for Higgs, Johnson, Truman, Bodden & Co., Special Counsel, period: 5/1/2013 to 7/31/2013, fee: \$70,193.25, expenses: \$1,186.90 (cc-5569) Soroker - Agmon as Special Counsel to the Trustee Application for Allowance of Interim Compensation for Services Rendered and Reimbursement of Actual and Necessary Expenses Incurred from May 1, 2013 through July 31, 2013 for Soroker-Agmon, Special Counsel, period: 5/1/2013 to 7/31/2013,	RULINGS DESCRIPTION PAGE (cc-5568) Higgs & Johnson (formerly Higgs Johnson Truman Bodden & Co.) as Special Counsel to the Trustee's Application for Allowance of Interim Compensation for Services Rendered and Reimbursement of Actual and Necessary Expenses Incurred from May 1, 2013 through July 31, 2013 for Higgs, Johnson, Truman, Bodden & Co., Special Counsel, period: 5/1/2013 to 7/31/2013, fee: \$70,193.25, expenses: \$1,186.90 32 (cc-5569) Soroker - Agmon as Special Counsel to the Trustee Application for Allowance of Interim Compensation for Services Rendered and Reimbursement of Actual and Necessary Expenses Incurred from May 1, 2013 through July 31, 2013 for Soroker-Agmon, Special Counsel, period: 5/1/2013 to 7/31/2013,

	Pg 36 0f 44			-
			Page 36	
1	INDEX			
2				
3	RULINGS			
4	DESCRIPTION	PAGE	LINE	
5	(cc-5570) Graf & Pitkowitz Rechtsanwalte			
6	GmbH as Special Counsel to the Trustee's			
7	Application for Allowance of Interim			
8	Compensation for Services Rendered and			
9	Reimbursement of Actual and Necessary			
10	Expenses Incurred from May 1, 2013 through			
11	July 31, 2013 for Graf & Pitkowitz			
12	Rechtsanwalte GmbH, Special Counsel,			
13	period: 5/1/2013 to 7/31/2013, fee:			
14	\$548,430.68, expenses: \$5,068.65	32	13	
15				
16	(cc-5571) SCA Creque as Special Counsel			
17	to the Trustee Application for Allowance			
18	of Interim Compensation for Services			
19	Rendered and Reimbursement of Actual and			
20	Necessary Expenses Incurred from May 1,			
21	2013 through July 31, 2013 for SCA Creque,			
22	Special Counsel, period: 5/1/2013 to			
23	7/31/2013, fee: \$28,090.07, expenses:			
24	\$20.00	32	13	
25				
				- 1

	Pg 37 01 44 Page 37	
1	INDEX	
2		
3	RULINGS	
4	DESCRIPTION PAGE LINE	
5	(cc-5572) Young, Conaway, Stargatt & Taylor,	
6	LLP as Special Counsel to the Trustee	
7	Application for Allowance of Interim	
8	Compensation for Services Rendered and	
9	Reimbursement of Actual and Necessary	
10	Expenses Incurred from May 1, 2013 through	
11	July 31, 2013 for Young, Conaway, Stargatt	
12	& Taylor, LLP, Special Counsel, period:	
13	5/1/2013 to 7/31/2013, fee: \$20,503.80,	
14	expenses: \$1,555.39 32 13	
15		
16	(cc-5573) Williams, Barristers & Attorneys	
17	as Special Counsel to the Trustee Application	
18	for Allowance of Interim Compensation for	
19	Services Rendered and Reimbursement of Actual	
20	and Necessary Expenses Incurred from May 1,	
21	2013 through July 31, 2013 for Williams,	
22	Barristers & Attorneys, Special Counsel,	
23	period: 5/1/2013 to 7/31/2013, fee:	
24	\$101,219.42, expenses: \$0 32 13	
25		

	Pg 38 01 44		
			Page 38
1	INDEX		
2			
3	RULINGS		
4	DESCRIPTION	AGE	LINE
5	(cc-5566) Trustee and Baker & Hostetler,		
6	LLP's Thirteenth Application for Allowance		
7	of Interim Compensation for Services		
8	Rendered and Reimbursement of Actual and		
9	Necessary Expenses Incurred from May 1,		
10	2013 through July 31, 2013 for Baker &		
11	Hostetler, LLP, Trustee's Attorney, period:		
12	5/1/2013 to 7/31/2013, fee: \$31,487,024.25,		
13	expenses: \$810,213.07	32	13
14			
15	(cc-5574) Taylor Wessing as Special Counsel		
16	to the Trustee Application for Allowance of		
17	Interim Compensation for Services Rendered		
18	and Reimbursement of Actual and Necessary		
19	Expenses Incurred from May 1, 2013 through		
20	July 31, 2013 for Taylor Wessing, Special		
21	Counsel, period: 5/1/2013 to 7/31/2013, fees:		
22	\$3,609,012.69, expenses: \$2,056,092.17	32	13
23			
24			
25			

г	Pg 39 01 44	
		Page 39
1	INDEX	
2		
3	RULINGS	
4	DESCRIPTION PAGE	LINE
5	(cc-55834) Kelley, Wolter & Scott, P.A. as	
6	Special Counsel to the Trustee Application	
7	for Allowance of Interim Compensation for	
8	Services Rendered and Reimbursement of Actual	
9	and Necessary Expenses Incurred from July 1,	
10	2013 through July 31, 2013 for Kelley, Wolter	
11	& Scott, P.A., Special Counsel, period:	
12	7/1/2013 to 7/31/2013, fees: \$3,733.20,	
13	expenses: \$110.00 32	13
14		
15	(cc-5575) UGGC & Associates as Special	
16	Counsel to the Trustee Application for	
17	Allowance of Interim Compensation for	
18	Services Rendered and Reimbursement of Actual	
19	and Necessary Expenses Incurred from May 1,	
20	2013 through July 31, 2013 for UGGC &	
21	Associates, Special Counsel, period: 5/1/2013	
22	to 7/31/2013, fees: \$170,393.77, expenses:	
23	\$4,896.64	13
24		
25		

· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
		Page 40
INDEX		
RULINGS		
DESCRIPTION	PAGE	LINE
(cc-5576) Triay Stagnetto Neish as Special		
Counsel to the Trustee Application for		
Allowance of Interim Compensation for		
Services Rendered and Reimbursement of		
Actual and Necessary Expenses Incurred		
from May 1, 2013 through July 31, 2013 for		
Triay Stagnetto Neish, Special Counsel,		
period: 5/1/2013 to 7/31/2013, fees:		
\$31,993.53, expenses: \$221.87	32	13
(cc-5577) Werder Vigano as Special Counsel		
to the Trustee Application for Allowance		
of Interim Compensation for Services		
Rendered and Reimbursement of Actual and		
Necessary Expenses Incurred from May 1,		
2013 through July 31, 2013 for Werder		
Vigano, Special Counsel, period: 5/1/2013		
to 7/31/2013, fees: \$5,701.15, expenses:		
\$0	32	13
	RULINGS DESCRIPTION (cc-5576) Triay Stagnetto Neish as Special Counsel to the Trustee Application for Allowance of Interim Compensation for Services Rendered and Reimbursement of Actual and Necessary Expenses Incurred from May 1, 2013 through July 31, 2013 for Triay Stagnetto Neish, Special Counsel, period: 5/1/2013 to 7/31/2013, fees: \$31,993.53, expenses: \$221.87 (cc-5577) Werder Vigano as Special Counsel to the Trustee Application for Allowance of Interim Compensation for Services Rendered and Reimbursement of Actual and Necessary Expenses Incurred from May 1, 2013 through July 31, 2013 for Werder Vigano, Special Counsel, period: 5/1/2013 to 7/31/2013, fees: \$5,701.15, expenses:	DESCRIPTION PAGE (cc-5576) Triay Stagnetto Neish as Special Counsel to the Trustee Application for Allowance of Interim Compensation for Services Rendered and Reimbursement of Actual and Necessary Expenses Incurred from May 1, 2013 through July 31, 2013 for Triay Stagnetto Neish, Special Counsel, period: 5/1/2013 to 7/31/2013, fees: \$31,993.53, expenses: \$221.87 32 (cc-5577) Werder Vigano as Special Counsel to the Trustee Application for Allowance of Interim Compensation for Services Rendered and Reimbursement of Actual and Necessary Expenses Incurred from May 1, 2013 through July 31, 2013 for Werder Vigano, Special Counsel, period: 5/1/2013 to 7/31/2013, fees: \$5,701.15, expenses:

	Py 41 01 44		Page 41
1	INDEX		
2			
3	RULINGS		
4	DESCRIPTION	PAGE	LINE
5	(cc-5578) Greenfield Stein & Senior, LLP as		
6	Special Counsel to the Trustee Application		
7	for Allowance of Interim Compensation for		
8	Services Rendered and Reimbursement of Actual	1	
9	and Necessary Expenses Incurred from May 1,		
10	2013 through July 31, 2013 for Greenfield		
11	Stein & Senior, LLP, Special Counsel,		
12	period: 5/1/2013 to 7/31/2013, fees:		
13	\$863.10, expenses: \$0	32	13
14			
15	(cc-5579) Browne Jacobson, LLP as Special		
16	Counsel to the Trustee Application for		
17	Allowance of Interim Compensation for		
18	Services Rendered and Reimbursement of		
19	Actual and Necessary Expenses Incurred		
20	from May 1, 2013 through July 31, 2013 for		
21	Browne Jacobson, Special Counsel, period:		
22	5/1/2013 to 7/31/2013, fees: \$408,874.01,		
23	expenses: \$14,836.89	32	13
24			
25			

	Pg 42 0f 44		
			Page 42
1	INDEX		
2			
3	RULINGS		
4	DESCRIPTION	PAGE	LINE
5	(cc-5580) Eugene F. Collins as Special		
6	Counsel to the Trustee Application for		
7	Allowance of Interim Compensation for		
8	Services Rendered and Reimbursement of		
9	Actual and Necessary Expenses Incurred from		
10	May 1, 2013 through July 31, 2013 for		
11	Eugene F. Collins, Special Counsel, period:		
12	5/1/2013 to 7/31/2013, fees: \$87,053.58,		
13	expenses: \$240.10	32	13
14			
15	(cc-5581) Ritter & Ritter Advokatur as		
16	Special Counsel to the Trustee Application		
17	for Allowance of Interim Compensation for		
18	Services Rendered and Reimbursement of Actual		
19	and Necessary Expenses Incurred from May 1,		
20	2013 through July 31, 2013 for Ritter &		
21	Ritter Advokatur, Special Counsel, period:		
22	5/1/2013 to 7/31/2013, fees: \$38,150.06,		
23	expenses: \$1,851.92	32	13
24			
25			

	Pg 43 01 44		
			Page 43
1	INDEX		
2			
3	RULINGS		
4	DESCRIPTION	PAGE	LINE
5	(cc-5582) Munari Giudici Maniglio Panfili E		
6	Associati as Special Counsel to the Trustee		
7	Application for Allowance of Interim		
8	Compensation for Services Rendered and		
9	Reimbursement of Actual and Necessary		
10	Expenses Incurred from May 1, 2013 through		
11	July 31, 2013 for Munari Giudici Maniglio		
12	Panfili E Associati, Special Counsel,		
13	period: 5/1/2013 to 7/31/2013, fees:		
14	\$56,337.36, expenses: \$201.21	32	13
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

Page 44 1 CERTIFICATION 2 3 I, Sherri L. Breach, CERT*D-397, certified that the 4 foregoing transcript is a true and accurate record of the 5 proceedings. 6 Sherri L Digitally signed by Sherri L Breach DN: cn=Sherri L Breach, o, ou, email=digital1@veritext.com, 7 **Breach** c=US Date: 2013.12.19 16:47:46 -05'00' 8 SHERRI L. BREACH 9 AAERT Certified Electronic Reporter & Transcriber 10 11 CERT*D-397 12 13 Veritext 14 330 Old Country Road 15 Suite 300 16 Mineola, New York 11501 17 18 Date: December 19, 2013 19 20 21 22 23 24 25